

**REMARKS**

Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks. Claims 4-13, 16-21, 23-25, 29, and 30 are pending.

Claims 29 and 30 are the independent claims.

Claims 29 and 30 have been amended.

Claims 1-3, 14, 15, 22, 26-28, and 31-33 have been cancelled, without prejudice to or disclaimer of, the subject matter recited therein.

Claim 29 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112. Applicant has amended the claim to overcome the inconsistency indicated by the Examiner.

Specification and claims 29 and 30 were objected due to informalities. Applicant has amended the claims 29 and 30 to overcome the informalities indicated by the Examiner.

Claims 29 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101. In response, Applicant has amended the claim to recite that "at least one of: the receiving, the parsing, the identifying, and the comparing are performed by at least one computer". Thus, the method is being tied to a particular machine - the at least one computer.

Claims 4-13, 16-21, 23-25, 29, and 30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US 2002/0054090 (*Silva*). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 6 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Silva* in view of US 7,039,037 (*Wang*). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 9, 11, 21, and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Silva* in view of US 2002/0062467 (*Hunzinger*). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

**The Rejection according to 35 U.S.C. 102(b)**

The Rejection according to 35 U.S.C. 102(b) is traversed because claim 29, as amended, recites features not taught by the cited art. For example, claim 29 recites *inter alia*, a visited content that includes embedded hyperlinks that are each associated with a corresponding title and a corresponding target uniform resource locator (URL), wherein each title is presented to the user over a webpage having a different URL than the target URL;

Claim 29 further recites the feature of each title being associated with a respective target URL, wherein each target URL is a dynamic URL comprising periodically changing code numbers identifiable, in real-time, only by the content server.

By the aforementioned features, a sequence of titles selected by the user may be identified. Advantageously, the sequence of titles may indicate the contextual location of a user. Focusing on the titles, rather than the URLs, overcomes the issue of dynamic URLs that are changing periodically and are therefore less traceable.

*Silva* is silent regarding the aforementioned distinction drawn in claim 29, as amended, between a title, a URL of the webpage exhibiting the title, and a target URL to which the selection of the title leads.

This silence is not surprising since *Silva* does not relate at all to "titles" in the sense recited in amended claim 29. Rather, *Silva* teaches a system [that] uses techniques to ensure that replaying a sequence of recorded actions will lead to the intended page, and that the correct fragments are extracted - even when underlying pages are modified. (*Silva*, paragraph [0041]). Thus, *Silva* merely

enables the tracking of a user's browsing actions throughout a website and does not compare sequences of titles (associated with URL links).

*Silva* further fails to teach a sequence of titles (associated with URL links) specifically in the context of the aforementioned distinction drawn between a target link, the title associated with the target link, and the URL address of the webpage on which the title is presented.

Applicant submits that *Silva*, by teaching a system that ensures replaying a sequence of recorded actions is functionally distinguishable from the tracking of the sequence of titles achieved by the method recited in Claim 29, as amended.

In addition, Applicant further amended claim to recite the feature of comparing the sequence of user selected hyperlink titles of the short term user surfing course with a **plurality of predefined sequences of titles** (emphasis added).

In The Office Action (Page 6) Examiner contends that the plurality of sequences of titles is equivalent to the pages visited by the user in *Silva*. The aforementioned amended recitation of **predefined sequences of titles** (being the original wording of the claim) makes it clear that predefined sequence cannot be the (actual) sequence of page visited as taught by *Silva*.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 29 as amended defines over the cited art.

Regarding Claim 30, Applicant has recited the aforementioned features of claim 29, in a system claim form.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 30 as amended also defines over the cited art.

**The Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)**

The rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are traversed because neither *Wang* nor *Hunzinger*, either alone or in combination with *Silva*, teach the aforementioned features newly recited in amended claims 29 and 30. Therefore, the rejected claims, being depended on Claims 29 and 30 are too novel and non-obvious in view of the cited art.

Specifically, *Wang* teaches a method to provide control and policy enforcement of WAP services (*Wang*, Abstract) and is silent as to aforementioned feature (absent in *Silva* too) of sequences of titles associates with URL addresses. *Hunzinger* teaches a content usage-base system (Abstract) that is also silent as to sequence of titles associates with URL addresses.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that the Office failed to establish *prima facie* obviousness of the claimed invention.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 29 and 30 patentably define the present invention over the citations of record. Further, the dependent claims should also be allowable for the same reasons as their respective base claims and further due to the additional features that they recite.

Separate and individual consideration of the dependent claims is respectfully requested.

Applicant believes that the present Amendment is responsive to each of the points raised by the Examiner in the Official Action. However, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to such matters.

Serial No. 10/799,863

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance.

An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

If there any fees in addition to those being paid herewith for this Amendment, please charge the same to our deposit account 504438.

Respectfully submitted,

By: /Michael Kondoudis/

Michael Kondoudis

Reg. No. 42, 758

**The Law Office  
of Michael E. Kondoudis**

888 16<sup>th</sup> Street, NW  
Suite 800  
Washington, DC 20006  
202-349-9850